

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are now in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, and 15 have been amended to comply with formal requirements. Claim 12, in particular, has been amended to recite a method instead of a use, in accordance with U.S. practice. The claim amendments do not limit the claim scope. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,360,116 to Schmiletzky.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, a medicament retaining sheet comprising a first sheet having first and second faces and a second sheet having first and second faces, wherein the first face of the second sheet and the second face of the first sheet are opposed and bonded together and wherein the first sheet includes lines of weakness defining a plurality of medicament release zones. Claim 15 recites, among other features, a retaining sheet and a label having first and second faces, said first face having an adhesive applied thereto and wherein said label includes lines of weakness defining a plurality of medicament release zones. At least these features of the independent claims cannot reasonably be considered to be suggested in Schmiletzky.

Schmiletzky suggests a blister pack that is made essentially of the same types of materials to facilitate recycling of the blister packs after use. Schmiletzky further suggests, at Fig. 3, a cover film 4 covering a recess in the base section film 1. However, Schmiletzky fails to suggest a medicament retaining sheet comprising a first and a second sheet, as recited in claim 1, or a label and a retaining sheet, as recited in claim 15, wherein only one sheet is perforated. Accordingly, Schmiletzky fails to realize all of the associated benefits of the claimed subject matter discussed throughout Applicants' disclosure. Specifically, as set forth in Fig. 2 of Schmiletzky, the cover is cut or perforated such that the entire thickness of the cover, together with the adhesive layer and also a portion of the base section is cut. By contrast, claim 1 recites that only the first sheet includes lines of weakness and claim 15 recites that only the label includes lines of weakness. Accordingly, the claimed subject matter provides enhanced security against inappropriate

administration of a medicament by making removal of the medicament from the blister pack more difficult. Specifically, the first sheet recited in claim 1 has lines of weakness, such as perforations, to allow the portions of the first sheet to be removed prior to pushing the medicament through the second sheet, or, in another preferred embodiment in which the two sheets are adhered to each other, by removing both sheets in a single step. In any case, more force is required to push the medicament through the non-perforated sheet. Thus, the claimed subject matter provides enhanced security to a blister pack by reducing the likelihood of a child gaining access to a medicament.

Schmiletzky teaches away from the claimed subject matter. Specifically, as set forth at col. 1, line 42, Schmiletzky seeks to permit easy removal of a tablet from a blister pack. The force needed to push a tablet through a perforated cover, as suggested in Schmiletzky, is lower than the force needed to push a medicament through a second sheet or a retaining sheet having no lines of weakness, as recited in claims 1 and 15, respectively. Therefore, Schmiletzky suggests a blister pack which is easier to obtain the contents from and which is less secure against access by children.

Claims 2-14 and 16-22 depend from claims 1 and 15, respectively. Claims 2-14 and 16-22 are in condition for allowance for at least their respective dependence on allowable claims 1 and 15, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/582,583
Amendment dated July 30, 2008
Reply to Office Action of April 30, 2008

Docket No.: 21046-00057-US1

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 21046-00057-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: July 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Georg M. Hasselmann/
Georg M. Hasselmann
Registration No.: 62,324
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants